

REMARKS

Claims 30 to 51, 53, and 57 were pending in the application at the time of examination. Claims 30 to 51, 53, and 57 stand rejected as anticipated.

Applicants have amended Claims 30, 43, 47, 51, 53 and 57 to make it clear that the recited elements and methods are on a small footprint device, and also that the entry point object permits direct access to information in one context from another context where the two contexts are separated by a context barrier.

Claims 30 to 51, 53, and 57 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by WIPO Patent Publication No. WO 98/32073, hereinafter referred to as Bischof. The rejection stated:

As per claims 30, 43, 47, 51, 53, and 57, Bischof discloses the creation and use of guard objects (context barriers) for processing invocations of a context's entry point (see p. 5, lines 26-28) before those contexts are instantiated in response to object requests (see p. 10, lines 10-33). Since execution continues as usual if the guard does not indicate an error (preventing or not preventing access), the context inherently has one or more program modules with executable instructions (see p. 11, lines 1-25). Each context has protected object definitions (see p. 8, lines 11 -1 9). Since it is a computer implementation, there are inherently a processing element and memory for the invention. There are inherently at least zero data definitions. The contexts are in the JVM "sandbox," apart from the remainder of the operating system (see p. 4, lines 14-1 9; p. 5, lines 22-24; and p. 19, lines 12-20).

Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 30, 43, 47, 51, 53, and 57. Applicants respectfully note that it is not enough that Bischof show similar features, but rather the MPEP requires:

**TO ANTICIPATE A CLAIM, THE REFERENCE MUST TEACH EVERY
ELEMENT OF THE CLAIM**

. . . . "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim."
Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim, but this is not an *ipsissimis verbis* test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

MPEP § 2131, 8 Ed., Rev. 6, p. 2100-67 (Sept. 2007). The MPEP demonstrates that it is not sufficient that Bischof generally shows the invention. Rather, Bischof must show the invention in as complete detail as contained in the Claims. However, even this is not enough, Bischof must also show the elements arranged as required by the claim. The rejection, as demonstrated below, fails to meet the criteria put forth in the MPEP and so a prima facie anticipation rejection has not been made.

Applicants note that each of the inventions includes a small footprint device. The rejection has cited no teaching or suggestion of such a device in Bischof. Accordingly, Bischof fails to show the invention in as complete detail as contained in the claims. According to the MPEP, as quoted above, this alone is sufficient to overcome the anticipation rejection. Moreover, Bischof teaches away from such an implementation by teaching a distributed computer system.

Not only does Bischof fail to show the invention in as complete detail as contained in the claims, but also Bischof fails to teach the elements arranged as required by the claims.

Each of the claims recites two separate and distinct elements, a context barrier and an entry point object. The rejection has failed to cite any teaching of an entry point object as recited in these claims.

The rejection relies upon the guard object as teaching the context barrier. However, the rejection has cited no teaching of an entry point object for direct access to information from a program in one context to another program in a different context where the two contexts are separated by a context barrier. Thus, each of Claims 30 to 51, 53 and 57 distinguish over Bischof for multiple reasons. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 30 to 51, 53, and 57.

Claims 30 to 51, 53, and 57 remain in the application. Claims 30, 43, 47, 51, 53 and 57 have been amended. Claims 1 to 29, 52 and 54 to 56 were canceled previously. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant(s) respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicant(s).

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on July 3, 2008.



Attorney for Applicant(s)

July 3, 2008
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Forrest Gunnison
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 32,899
Tel.: (831) 655-0880